

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,453	04/20/2004	Raymond R. Gosselin	58032US0010	3998
32692 7.	590 06/15/2006	EXAMINER		
3M INNOVATIVE PROPERTIES COMPANY PO BOX 33427 ST. PAUL, MN 55133-3427			NORDMEYER, PATRICIA L	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
,			1772	

DATE MAILED: 06/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		10/828,453	GOSSELIN, RAYMOND R.			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Patricia L. Nordmeyer	1772			
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app or Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	e correspondence address			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	CORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DAMPS of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Depriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATI 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fre, cause the application to become ABANDO	ON. It is timely filed from the mailing date of this communication. From the mailing date of this communication.			
Status						
1)⊠	Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 A	<i>pril 2006</i> .				
2a) <u></u>	This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.					
3)□	☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
	closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.			
Disposit	ion of Claims	•				
4)⊠ 5)□	Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdray Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-26</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/o	wn from consideration.				
Applicat	ion Papers					
9)[The specification is objected to by the Examine	er.				
·	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc		e Examiner.			
	Applicant may not request that any objection to the	drawing(s) be held in abeyance.	See 37 CFR 1.85(a).			
11)□	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	•	· ·			
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119					
12) <u>□</u> a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document: 2. Certified copies of the priority document: 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document: application from the International Bureau See the attached detailed Office action for a list	s have been received. s have been received in Applic rity documents have been rece u (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No sived in this National Stage			
Attachmen						
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail				
3) 🔲 Infor	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) er No(s)/Mail Date	_	al Patent Application (PTO-152)			

Application/Control Number: 10/828,453

Art Unit: 1772

DETAILED ACTION

Withdrawn Rejections

1. The 35 U.S.C. 102(e) rejection of claims 1 – 26 as anticipated by Wright et al. (USPN 6,416,857) in the office action dated January 6, 2006 is withdrawn due to Applicant's arguments in the response dated April 6, 2006.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wright et al. in view of Mocilnikar et al. (USPN 5,346,259).

Wright et al. disclose a tamper indicating device (Column 1, lines 9-10) used in combination with an object having secured information (Column 9, lines 7-18) comprising a backing having a first side and a second side (Column 3, lines 15-16), wherein the backing comprises a first phase and a second phase (Column 3, lines 17-19), wherein the backing has a first level of light diffusion, and when a peeling force is applied to the backing, the backing fractures (Column 3, lines 32-38) and has a second level of light diffusion that is a higher level of light diffusion than the first level of light diffusion (Column 2, lines 27-31) a flood coat

Application/Control Number: 10/828,453

Art Unit: 1772

applied to the second side of the backing (Column 4, lines 53 - 56), an adhesive layer bonded to the flood coat (Column 5, lines 56 - 58) in claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 14 16, 18, 21, 22 and 25. Regarding claims 2, 5, 9, 13, 14, 17, 20, 23 and 24, the tamper indicating device further comprises at least one security marking applied to the first side of the backing (Column 4, lines 56-59). As in claims 4, 11, 15, 19 and 26, the adhesive layer is a pressure sensitive adhesive layer covered with a release liner (Column 5, lines 56 - 58). Wright et al. also disclose a tamper indicating device used in combination with an object having secured information (Column 9, lines 7-18) comprising a backing having a first side and a second side (Column 3, lines 15-16), wherein the backing comprises a first phase and a second phase (Column 3, lines 17 - 19), wherein the backing is light transmissive, and when a peeling force is applied to the backing, the backing fractures (Column 3, lines 32 - 38) and become more opaque (Column 2, lines 27 - 31); an adhesive layer applied to the second side of the backing (Column 5, lines 56 - 58), wherein the adhesive is colored and bonded to the application surface of the object (Column 9, lines 37 – 42). However, Wright et al. fail to disclose the flood coat defining a window therein, a mask applied to the tamper indicating device, the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat and the security marking has the same color as the flood coat.

Mocilnikar et al. teach an anti-theft label having a flood coat defining a window therein (Figure 3, #32), a mask applied to the tamper indicating device (Figure 3, #30), the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat (Figure 3, #30) and the security marking has the same color as the flood coat (Column 4, lines 34 - 43) for the purpose of having a label that comprises a fragile, easily tearable segment (Column 3, lines 1 - 3) placed over the

Art Unit: 1772

information, wherein the label and information become unusable due to the damaged label

(Column 3, lines 19-29).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to have provided the flood coat layer with a window covered by a masking layer in Wright et al. in order to have a label that comprises a fragile, easily tearable segment placed over the information, wherein the label and information become unusable due to the damaged label as taught by Mocilnikar et al.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-26 have been considered but are most in view of the new ground(s) of rejection. However, since the same prior art is being used in the above rejection, the arguments will be responded to below.

In response to Applicant's argument that Wright et al. fails to disclose the flood coat defining a window therein, a mask applied to the tamper indicating device, the mask being in partial or whole registration with the window in the flood coat and the security marking has the same color as the flood coat, please see the newly presented rejection of Wright et al. in view of Mocilnikar et al.

Art Unit: 1772

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Patricia L. Nordmeyer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1496. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon.-Thurs. from 7:00-4:30 & alternate Fridays.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Harold Y. Pyon can be reached on (571) 272-1498. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Atum Madmure Patricia L. Nordmeyer

Examiner

Art Unit 1772